

**LITCHFIELD PLANNING BOARD**

**DRAFT**

**February 3, 2009**

Minutes approved 3/3/09

**Members present:**

Steve Perry, Chairman

Jayson Brennen, Vice Chairman

Alison Douglas, Clerk

Leon Barry

Frank A. Byron, Selectmen's representative

Marc Ducharme

Edward Almeida

**Members not present:**

Carlos Fuertes, Alternate

**Also present:**

Joan McKibben, Administrative Assistant

Steve Wagner, Nashua Regional Planning Commission, Circuit Rider

**AGENDA**

**1. Rene Theroux/Christina Gerossie - The Board to consider an application for a lot line adjustment. The lot line adjustment will add 6.58 acres to the easterly side of Map 15 Lot 6 at 315 Charles Bancroft Highway from Map 16 Lot 86, 14 Westview Drive.**

**2. Steve Schaffer, Nashua Regional Planning Commission, to discuss the CTAP buildout project**

**3. Any Other Business:**

**a. Approve 1/20/09 Minutes of Meeting**

Chairman Perry called the meeting to order.

**1. Rene Theroux/Christina Gerossie, application for a lot line adjustment.**

**Executive Summary:** Lot line adjustment between lots 16-86 and 15-6. Lot A (6.58 acres) is being conveyed to lot 15-6 from 16-86. See reference plans (renumbered in order from oldest to newest) #5 – Subdivision of 15-6; October 6, 2003 (HRCD Plan 3304) and #6 – Subdivision of 15-6, October 31, 2007 (HRCD Plan 36221) for details, easements, encumbrances, etc.

1  
2 Mr. Tobin Farwell, Farwell Engineering, came forward representing the applicants Rene  
3 Theroux and Christina Gerossie. Mr. Theroux was present. Mr. Farwell said he has a  
4 letter of authorization to represent both landowners. Mr. Farwell explained this is a  
5 request for a lot line adjustment involving 315 Charles Bancroft Highway. There is a  
6 PSNH easement that separates the two lots. The Gerossie lot consists of 30 acres and will  
7 go to 24 acres. The Theroux lot is 9 ½ acres and six acres will be added. Mr. Farwell said  
8 they did not delineate the wetlands for the Gerossie lot because it is a large lot; it is over  
9 600 feet to where they are proposing to adjust the property line. The existing house is on  
10 Pennichuck Water service, there is a leachfield and there should be no impact because  
11 there is nothing out back to impact it.

12  
13 Mr. Farwell: We submitted a waiver request because this is to be considered a  
14 subdivision application. A waiver request because we are supposed to provide a wet and  
15 dry areas for the two parcels...as I just explained, we did not provide for the Gerossie  
16 parcel. Also, the existing topography and also the wetlands are supposed to be delineated  
17 in the field for review but because of the nature of this project, we feel a waiver is  
18 warranted for those requests. There are no buildings, no new buildable lots; it starts as  
19 two building lots and will end as two building lots.

20  
21 Chairman Perry opened the meeting to public comment. There was no public comment.  
22 Chairman closed public session.

23  
24 The Clerk read aloud the request for waivers dated February 3, 2009. Mr. Barry asked if  
25 either parcel could be subdivided later on. Mr. Farwell said they could not be subdivided  
26 because they do not have adequate frontage.

27  
28 **Waivers** - Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** that we grant the waiver for 530.00 Subdivision  
29 information d. The area of all proposed lots denoting a wetland area, dry area and total  
30 area (in acres). Mr. Brennen seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0.

31  
32 Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** that we grant the waiver for 530.00 Subdivision information  
33 e. Existing and proposed topography for the entire parcel with contour intervals not to  
34 exceed 5 feet. Mr. Brennen seconded. Mr. Barry asked for an explanation what is meant,  
35 “not to exceed 5 feet”. He was told that usually the contours are two feet and do not  
36 exceed 5 feet. Motion carried 7-0-0.

37  
38 Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** that we grant the waiver for 540.00 Field Delineation a.  
39 Wetland areas to be flagged in the field prior to submission of the application. Mr. Barry  
40 seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0.

41  
42 **Application acceptance**

43  
44 Mrs. McKibben confirmed that all the fees were paid and abutters were noticed. Mrs.  
45 Douglas **MOTIONED** that we accept the application for the Theroux/Gerossie lot

line adjustment between lots 16-86 and 15-6. Mr. Barry seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0.

**Plan Review and Approval**

The Board reviewed Mr. Wagner's checklist.

Chairman opened the meeting to public comment. There was no public comment.

Chairman closed public comment. There were no further questions from the Board members.

Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** to conditionally approve the proposed lot line adjustment between Lot 6-86 and 15-6 with the following conditions: renumber the reference plan, oldest to newest; before and after lot sizes and lot "A" should be in a table form in notes; label new lot lines; 510 c & e - confirm all signatures, dates and seals are on plan; 520 d - show setbacks/easements for Lot 16-86; 520 e - Lot 16-86 add note "on public water"; 850.10 - provide digital data submission; add note "Bounds to be set and certified by a LLS (letter to the Board prior to recording); correct spelling for word drainage; add footage on drainage easement on the plan; plan copies with professional seals and signatures; original Mylar with professional seals and signatures; electronic submission per regulations (as-builts as required); all fees paid and escrow maintained as required; changes to Plat as detailed in minutes and this report (list). Mr. Ducharme seconded. Vote: Motioned carried 6-1-0.

**CTAP BUILDOUT ANALYSIS**

Mr. Steve Schaffer, NRPC, came forward to discuss a buildout analysis for Litchfield. Mr. Schaffer: CTAP is a planning program involved with I-93 widening. Litchfield is a CTAP community. One of the programs CTAP is doing is a buildout growth analysis plan, paid for by CTAP program. Mr. Schaffer said that the analysis is not something that was requested but that CTAP felt that it would be a tool to help communities with the widening. The CTAP buildout was set up as a scenario plan, involving several scenarios, then and they run a buildout which is an analysis of Litchfield's growth capacity to see what the results are and there are some 40 indicators they look at to compare the different scenarios that we run with maps and charts.

Mr. Schaffer went on to explain the different scenarios. Mr. Schaffer: The first scenario is a base buildout using your standard land use regulations that exists now. The second is a standard alternative where we systematically make changes and we make the same changes to every town in CTAP and we look at how the towns grew differently under those plan views and zoning changes. The third thing is the community scenario where someone in the community, a group of volunteers, the Planning Board, whoever has an interest and we try to have you designate an alternative; different zoning, different densities within existing zoning, anything you would like to see changed. That is basically what we are here tonight for brainstorming on some changes we could use

1  
2 for the community center.  
3  
4

5 The Board reviewed the maps provided. Mr. Schaffer: We changed densities where  
6 things are allowed to be built, made changes between the base which is your current  
7 zone and the standard alternative. We are asking you to come up with your own changes  
8 which might be based on discussions you have had; it might be based on your Master  
9 Plan. Some of the agricultural land along the river we have set up a new end zone where  
10 it is very similar to a conservation subdivision where 50% of the land has to be set aside  
11 and then the density is doubled, ½ acre minimum lot size, and the idea was to protect  
12 more of the land closer to the river. This is a buildout so we are assuming anything that is  
13 currently vacant is going to be developed. So, if you have a certain farm that you think is  
14 not going to be developed for your community scenario, you cannot have that be  
15 developed.  
16

17 Mr. Schaffer said the area close to Manchester they increased the density because it was  
18 felt that there is more potential for sewage.  
19

20 Mr. Brennen: Are you looking for input for potential zoning changes? Mr. Schaffer. We  
21 would like to see changes to test your scenario. One of the things about Litchfield when  
22 you did your buildout in 2005, you have a lot of developable commercial land  
23 particularly in the south, the Circumferential Highway. We developed all of this  
24 commercial...this time we are not doing it, we are assuming that a good portion of that is  
25 going to be developed residential. If it is zoned commercial and it is buildable, we build  
26 it out to as max as you can.  
27

28 Talk ensued. Mr. Schaffer: As I mentioned last time, it is just a scenario testing; a  
29 planning exercise. We make it pretty clear in the report that this is not a plan that the  
30 Town is putting forward; it is not anything official but it is simply an exercise, scenario.  
31

32 Mr. Brennen suggested that anything along Route 3A between Page Road and Robin  
33 Avenue should be low-density, keep it historical and agricultural character of the Town.  
34 Keep out any of the mixed use zone, etc. Mr. Barry said that Page Road and Route 102  
35 there is a potential to do density housing in that area. It was said that mixed use could be  
36 the entire northern commercial and all of the southern. It was also said to consider doing  
37 a town center as a mixed use. Mr. Schaffer: If you are adding more density in these  
38 mixed use areas, then you have the opportunity to reduce some density in other areas like  
39 along 3A; maybe conservation subdivisions where you have to have buffers or say lot  
40 sizes have to be larger.  
41

42 Mr. Perry: I would be fine along 3A increasing it to 2 or 2 ½ acres zoning but anything  
43 beyond 200 feet from the roadway could go to ½ acres, ¾ to make up for the difference.  
44 200 to 300 feet on each side or 250 feet. Then you would keep your corridor.  
45

1  
2 Mr. Schaffer said that one thing a buildout does not do it does not redevelop; it assumes  
3 whatever is there now is going to stay there in the same use. We are taken land that is  
4 vacant or buildable. Mr. Perry said he would not mind seeing a town-village center; the

5  
6 Town lot is 17 acres, and maybe have stores along Hillcrest. Develop a Northend village  
7 district – this would entail the whole Colby area and 3A and also allows mix use,  
8 residential. Mr. Perry said that he always thought a village district has stores with  
9 apartments on top.

10  
11 Mr. Brennen: This whole stretch right here from Romano to Mel's and vacant lot across  
12 the street that could be a nice mix use district and eventually have a sidewalk.

13  
14 Suggestions: Northend village district - put as mixed use. This would be Albuquerque,  
15 and down to Mel's and do multi family in the whole northend. Up north have mixed use  
16 along 3A from the village district north, carry mix use from the village district up to just  
17 past Corning Road to Temple Drive and the rest zone multi complexes, and working  
18 towards work force housing. Also, from Page Road south, make it all mixed use but also  
19 break it up like accessory residential, accessory dwelling units, heavy commercial. Mr.  
20 Schaffer will make the recommended changes and he will return with updated maps.

21  
22 **Minutes** - Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** to accept the minutes of January 20, 2009, as  
23 amended. Mr. Byron seconded. Motion carried 4-0-3.

24  
25 **Storm Water Permit** - Mr. Brennen told the Board that he read the new storm water  
26 permit. Mr. Brennen: It is just basically a continuation of the last one with the exception  
27 you have to start implementing some of the things we were talking about. You have to  
28 map out your entire storm water system and keep maintenance records on your storm  
29 water system, catch basin cleaning, etc.

30  
31 **Economic Stimulus** - Mr. Brennen said a lot of his clients, the City of Manchester went  
32 to the Board of Aldermen a couple of weeks ago and they had a listing of items ready if  
33 the funding comes and a lot of his clients in Mass are doing the same thing. He suggested  
34 Litchfield do the drainage project and if the money comes down as the bill is written, the  
35 State of NH will get somewhere on the order of 80 million dollars for clean water  
36 projects which includes drainage projects. That will go into the State Revolving Fund  
37 Loan program and then you would apply to the State to get the funds. I believe if you  
38 have \$100,000 project, you only pay the State \$25,000 and the rest is free money.

39  
40 Mr. Byron said if the voters say no, even if it is free money, you can't do it because of the  
41 Municipal Budget Act. Mr. Brennen said that he just wanted to bring it forward for the  
42 Town to think about it. In order to get stimulus money, you have to have shovel-ready  
43 projects and you have to have a plan in place.

**Litchfield Planning Board**

**February 3, 2009**

1

2 There being no further business, a **MOTION** was made to adjourn the meeting. Mrs.  
3 Douglas seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

4

5 Lorraine Dogopoulos

6 (Recording Secretary) transcribed from tapes